DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 756 FL 024 698

AUTHOR Jang, Younghee; Ulanoff, Sharon
TITLE Multiple Perspectives on the Implementation of a Program for Second Language Learners.
PUB DATE 1997-03-00
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Educational Objectives; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; High Schools; Middle Schools; *Organizational Communication; Parent Attitudes; *Parent Participation; Program Evaluation; Second Language Learning; *Second Language Programs; Secondary School Teachers; *Staff Development; Surveys; Teacher Aides; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effectiveness of a second language program in seven schools in a medium-sized school district in central California during the 1994-95 school year. Three educational levels (elementary, middle, and high school) were examined from the perspectives of teachers (n=194), administrators (n=23), instructional aides (n=40), parents (n=10), and others (n=14). The questionnaire administered to the respondents consisted of 67 Likert-type items on four scales: program goals and objectives; instructional practices, activities, and materials; staff development; and parent involvement. Questions were drawn from the district's school site plans, as well as from guidelines for programs serving second language learners, research, and practice. Results showed different response patterns from different constituent groups. Interviews at the school sites indicated lack of communication among staff. Parents were more satisfied than teachers, administrators, and aides about program implementation. Implementation differences were found between school levels; high schools were least satisfied with implementation, while elementary schools were most satisfied. The parent involvement component appeared to be the weakest area at elementary and middle school levels. At the high school level, the program goals and objectives component appeared weakest. Effective instructional practice was the strongest area at all levels. The questionnaire is appended. Contains 16 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 410 756

Multiple Perspectives on the Implementation of a Program for Second Language Learners

by

Younghee Jang
Visalia Unified School District

Sharon Ulanoff
California State University, San Marcos

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Younghee Jang
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the 1997 American Educational Research Association Annual meeting, Chicago, Il.

FL024698

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Multiple Perspectives on the Implementation of a Program for Second Language Learners

Objective

The purpose of this paper is to examine the results of a year long study of the effectiveness of the implementation of a program for second language learners (SLL program) at seven schools in one medium sized school district in central California during the 1994-95 school year. This data collection project is unique in that it explores program evaluation from multiple perspectives, specifically those of the teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals and parents in addition to the outcome measures which are typically the focus of program evaluation.

The evaluation plan has as an overarching goal a focus on effective program evaluation and student growth and to this end administered a series of questionnaires to assess such effectiveness in the areas of program goals and objectives, instruction, staff development and parent involvement. In order to achieve this goal the following evaluation questions were addressed:

- *How does the staff rate the SLL program currently being implemented;*
- *How do different school levels (elementary, middle, high) differ in terms of program evaluation;*
- *Which program areas are the most or least successful in the implementation of the SLL program; and*
- *What are the differences among the various staff groups in terms of implementation of the SLL program?*

This paper explores the answer to these questions based on questionnaire responses from the seven schools involved in the SLL program.

Theoretical Framework

Changing demographics throughout California and the country are causing school districts throughout the country to reevaluate the type of instruction they are currently offering

students within their classrooms. Increasingly programs are being called upon to address the needs of students from various language, culture and ethnic groups in monolingual, bilingual and multiple-language school contexts. As the faces of our classrooms change, one issue that remains constant is the best and most appropriate way to educate second language learners. how can educators ensure that they keep up with their English speaking peers academically, while learning English at the same time.

A central issue for the SLL program is the notion that second language learners (SLLs) have access to the core curriculum by using their primary language while developing English proficiency (Crawford, 1989; Cummins, 1994; 1981; Krashen, 1994, 1981; Krashen and Biber, 1988; Ramirez, 1992; and Thonis, 1994, 1981). Primary language instruction has been shown to promote academic achievement, positive psychosocial skills and English language develop (Krashen and Biber, 1988; Ramirez, 1992) in an efficient and effective manner. In fact Krashen and Biber (1988) support the notion that primary language instruction may be the best available second language program. While there are criticisms of this approach, most notably Baker (1992), Willig (1985) and Collier (1992) have demonstrated consistent benefits for the use of primary language instruction as a vehicle to both academic success and English language proficiency.

A further goal of the SLL program is the idea that when the primary language is used for instruction and support in the classroom, it serves to build self-esteem and high expectations for students, thus increasing their chances of success in the classroom (Cummins, 1989). An additional outcome is the inclusion of parent in classroom activities as parents are more apt and able to participate when they understand the language of instruction. Parents of SLLs who are in English only classrooms with monolingual teachers are effectively excluded from the classroom and do not feel empowered in terms of making decisions relating to their child's education (Cummins, 1989). This serves to influence the behavior of the student in relation to self esteem which in turn, impacts both behavior and achievement.

Another component of the SLL program deals with English language development. Simultaneously with primary language instruction is a need for instruction in English. Given the diversity in terms of student population with regard to levels of fluency, recency of immigration,

etc., it is important to view English language development as a communicative and interactive process (Krashen, 1994, 1981, Terrill, 1981). Various strategies and methodologies are used, including the Natural Approach (Terrill, 1981) and SDAIE (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English) (Lessow-Hurley, 1990). These approaches serve to promote English language proficiency in a natural progression with students taking on more instruction in English as they become more proficient (Krashen and Biber, 1988). Furthermore, there is an emphasis on student-centered engagement in language and content learning, as opposed to the passive teacher-centered instruction so often found in classes for SLLs (Ramirez, 1992).

And finally, an essential component of this program is the notion of staffing to best meet the needs of the students being served. If students are to succeed academically as well as become proficient English speakers, it is important that classes are staffed with personnel with the skills to ensure student success. As students progress through the various levels of English proficiency (Terrill, 1981) there is an effort to staff their classes with teachers who either have the California designations including LDS (language development specialist), BCC (bilingual certificate of competence), as well as the current (B)CLAD (bilingual cross cultural language and academic development) credential. Efforts are being made to train the current teaching force in the areas of language acquisition and development, English language development methodology and the both the culture of emphasis and general concepts of multicultural education (Sleeter and Grant, 1988).

Methodology

Participants

Seven schools (4 elementary, 2 middle and 1 high) in the district that implemented the SLL program participated in this study. A total of 281 faculty, staff and parents -112 from elementary, 101 from middle, and 70 from high schools- participated in this study. The participants were 23 administrators - 7, 7, and 9 from elementary, middle, and high schools, respectively; 194 teachers - 62, 79, and 53 from elementary, middle, and high schools, respectively; 40 instructional aides - 32, 7 and 1 from elementary, middle, and high schools,

respectively; 10 parents of the School Site Council (SSC) - 7 and 3 from elementary and middle schools, respectively; and 14 others - 4, 3 and 7 from elementary, middle, and high schools, respectively. Other respondents include counselors, librarians, secretaries, program specialists, other support staff and individuals who did not identify themselves as teachers, aides, administrators or parents.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire items were drawn from the district's School Site Plans as well as the Guidelines for programs serving SLLs, research and practice. The questionnaire consisted of 4 scales with a total of 67 items: Program Goals/Objectives (PGO) scale had 10 items, Instructional Practices, Activities, and Materials (IPAM) scale had 22 items, Staff Development (SD) scale had 18 items, and Parent Involvement (PI) scale had 17 items. A brief description of the four scales is presented below.

- *Program Goals and Objectives (PGO)* scale includes items dealing with development, communication, leadership and support, monitoring, shared decision making and responsibility, as well as program activities.
- *Instructional Practices, Activities and Materials (IPAM)* scale has items measuring high expectations and standards, effective instructional strategies including flexible groupings, higher-order thinking skills, use of instructional technology, sheltered instruction, articulation, acceleration, and tutoring, coordination of instructional services, and incorporation of a variety of instructional materials and manipulatives.
- *Staff Development (SD)* scale has items dealing with needs assessment, planning process, linkage between staff development activities and program objectives, administrative support, quality, content, and schedule of training, materials, and follow-up activities.
- *Parent Involvement (PI)* scale has items assessing parent participation in the program, parent involvement in the school and child's education, communication

between school and home, staff training in parent involvement strategies, and parent training and education.

Data Collection

The questionnaire was sent to all schools that implemented the SLL program in the district in April, 1995. The principal administered the questionnaire to all staff - principals and other administrators, teachers, aides, and parents of the School Site Council - during their regularly scheduled staff meeting. The individual responses were confidential to optimize reliability. Data were collected on the seven school sites between April 6 - 21, 1995.

Data Analysis

Scoring

The questionnaire asked respondents to indicate on a five-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, how well each item described the implementation of SLL program at their school. The value for each item ranged from 1 to 5, with the strongly disagree responses receiving a score of 1 and strongly agree responses a scores of 5. To score the questionnaire, responses were added and averaged for each scale, and each participant's averaged scores on each scale were used for the statistical analyses.

Analyses

In order to examine the responses for significant differences, analyses of variance (ANOVAs) and post hoc comparisons on all respondents and each category were performed. Whenever the ANOVAs showed significant differences among school levels and respondents, Tukey's HSD post hoc procedure was performed to examine comparisons between the means of the school levels and respondents. Due to the high correlation between the four scales multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) are currently in process. Results from the univariate analyses already carried out are currently reported pending multivariate analysis of the data.

Results and Conclusions

Staff Scale Score Rankings

Based on the average scores of the participants on each scale, the four scales were ranked relative to each other with the highest average score ranked 1 and the lowest average score ranked 4 for each school. As can be seen from Table 1, in regards to administrators, 43% of the schools rated the IPAM and staff development (SD) scales the highest, and none of the schools rated the PI scale the highest. For teachers and aides, 71% and 67% of the schools, respectively rated the IPAM scale the highest, and none of the schools (0%) rated the PGO scale the highest. In regards to parents, unlike teachers, administrators and aides, 80% of the schools rated the PGO scale the highest. Overall, 86% of the schools independent of different staff groups, rated the PI scale the lowest followed by the SD scale (43%).

Table 1 : ***Scale Score Rankings of SLL Program By Staff***

Scale	*Rankings*	*Percentage (%) of Schools*				
		Admin.	*Teachers*	*Aides*	*Parents*	*Others*
PGO	1	14.3	0.0	0.0	80.0	0.0
	2	42.9	28.6	16.7	20.0	0.0
	3	28.6	71.4	33.3	0.0	50.0
	4	14.3	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
IPAM	1	42.9	71.4	66.7	20.0	75.0
	2	14.3	14.3	16.7	20.0	25.0
	3	42.9	14.3	16.7	40.0	0.0
	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
SD	1	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0	25.0
	2	42.9	28.6	66.7	0.0	75.0
	3	14.3	0.0	33.3	40.0	0.0
	4	0.0	42.9	0.0	60.0	0.0
PI	1	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
	2	0.0	28.6	0.0	60.0	0.0
	3	14.3	14.3	16.7	20.0	50.0
	4	85.7	57.1	50.0	20.0	50.0

School Level Differences of Program Implementation

An analysis is carried out to examine whether there are any significant differences among schools (elementary, middle and high) in terms of their program evaluation. The analysis examined the relationship among school levels pertaining to each scale and different respondent groups. Below presents the results of the analysis on each of the program at each school level. Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 show means and standard deviations for each scale. The results of the separate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) and post hoc comparisons are also presented in these tables.

The ANOVAs revealed significant mean differences between school levels on all four scales; post hoc analysis revealed that the average score of each of the school levels were significantly different from each other. The average score of the elementary school level was significantly higher than that of the both high school level and middle school level, and the average score of the middle school level was also significantly higher than that of the high school level on all four scales. The average score of teachers and administrators showed significant differences between school levels on all four scales. The average scores of parents and others also showed significant differences between school levels on at least two scales. The average score of aides failed to show any significant differences between school levels.

Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations, and Significant Post Hoc Comparisons for PGO Scale

	SCHOOL LEVEL							
	Elementary (E)		**Middle (M)**		**High (H)**			
STAFF	***M***	***Std. dev.***	***M***	***Std. dev.***	***M***	***Std. dev.***	***F***	*Significant post hoc comparisons*
All Staff	4.07	.66	3.62	.69	2.97	.63	58.44***	E>M; E>H; M>H
Teachers	4.17	.65	3.56	.67	3.02	.65	44.47***	E>M; E>H; M>H
Aides	3.85	.66	3.76	.89	2.80	--	1.10	
Admin	4.41	.37	3.91	.75	2.90	.60	13.69***	E>H; M>H
Parents	4.24	.50	3.47	.41	--	--	5.61*	E>M
Others	3.25	.66	4.27	.29	2.79	.62	6.69*	M>H

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Table 3: Means, Standard Deviations, and Significant Post Hoc Comparisons for IPAM Scale

	SCHOOL LEVEL							
	Elementary (E)		Middle (M)		High (H)			
STAFF	*M*	*Std. dev.*	*M*	*Std. dev.*	*M*	*Std. dev.*	*F*	*Significant post hoc comparisons*
All Staff	4.15	.54	3.86	.64	3.27	.61	47.52***	E>M; E>H; M>H
Teachers	4.22	.56	3.83	.66	3.31	.64	30.57***	E>M; E>H; M>H
Aides	4.08	.47	4.02	.49	2.95	--	2.85	
Admin	4.07	.61	4.18	.59	3.11	.66	7.24**	E>H; M>H
Parents	4.16	.68	3.30	.19	--	--	4.34	
Others	3.86	.37	4.38	.41	3.27	.32	11.36**	E>H; M>H

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Table 4: Means, Standard Deviations, and Significant Post Hoc Comparisons for SD Scale

	SCHOOL LEVEL							
	Elementary (E)		Middle (M)		High (H)			
STAFF	*M*	*Std. dev.*	*M*	*Std. dev.*	*M*	*Std. dev.*	*F*	*Significant post hoc comparisons*
All Staff	4.10	.65	3.60	.66	3.03	.63	58.96***	E>M; E>H; M>H
Teachers	4.21	.67	3.54	.66	2.97	.69	48.24***	E>M; E>H; M>H
Aides	3.95	.58	3.63	.48	3.00	--	2.16	
Admin	4.33	.54	3.96	.74	3.25	.38	8.00**	E>H; M>H
Parents	3.89	.68	3.24	.21	--	--	2.47	
Others	3.68	.76	4.39	.35	3.23	.36	5.76*	M>H

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Table 5: Means, Standard Deviations, and Significant Post Hoc Comparisons for PI Scale

	SCHOOL LEVEL							
	Elementary (E)		Middle (M)		High (H)			
STAFF	*M*	*Std. dev.*	*M*	*Std. dev.*	*M*	*Std. dev.*	*F*	*Significant post hoc comparisons*
All Staff	3.88	.64	3.53	.48	3.12	.44	42.21***	E>M, E>H, M>H
Teachers	3.90	.68	3.53	.47	3.13	.49	28.33***	E>M, E>H, M>H
Aides	3.83	.59	3.38	.64	3.12	--	2.14	
Admin	3.86	.59	3.68	.62	3.10	.26	5.18*	E>H
Parents	4.18	.53	3.39	.34	--	--	5.57*	E>M
Others	3.38	.61	3.53	.10	3.09	.34	1.44	

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Staff Differences of Program Implementation Scales

This part of the report examines the results of how various respondent groups are different on their ratings of the program implementation. The questions addressed include: Do staff ratings appear to be similar across four scales or significantly different? Table 6 shows means and standard deviations for the SLL program, as well as the results of the ANOVAs and Tukey's HSD post hoc comparisons.

For PGO and PI scales, the average score of parents was the highest followed by the aides. The average score of others was the lowest followed by the teachers on the PGO scale and the administrators on the PI scale. Unlike the PGO and PI scales, the average score of aides was the highest on the IPAM and SD scales. The average score of others was the lowest on the IPAM scale and the average score of the teachers was the lowest on the SD scale followed by the others.

The ANOVAs revealed significant mean differences among different staff groups on the PGO and PI scales. The rest of the scales failed to show any significant mean differences among different staff groups. The parents' average score was significantly higher than the others' average score on both the PGO and PI scales.

Table 6: Means, Standard Deviations, and Significant Post Hoc Comparisons for SLL program

	STAFF						
	T	A	ADM	P	O		
SCALE	*M* (*Std. dev.*)	*M* (*Std. dev.*)	*M* (*Std. dev.*)	*M* (*Std. dev.*)	*M* (*Std. dev.*)	*F*	*Significant post hoc comparisons*
PGO	3.61 (.79)	3.81 (.71)	3.67 (.87)	4.01 (.58)	3.24 (.80)	2.03*	P>O
IPAM	3.81 (.71)	4.04 (.49)	3.73 (.78)	3.90 (.70)	3.68 (.57)	1.35	
SD	3.60 (.82)	3.87 (.58)	3.79 (.71)	3.70 (.65)	3.61 (.66)	1.26	
PI	3.54 (.62)	3.73 (.62)	3.51 (.59)	3.95 (.60)	3.27 (.42)	2.68**	P>O

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$.

In conclusion, the responses made by the different respondent groups demonstrated significant differences in relation to the implementation of the SLL program. Interviews at these seven school sites indicated that there was a lack of communication among staff, not all of the staff was aware of some of the program activities carried out or some of the goals and objectives of the program. Parents appear to be more satisfied than teachers, administrators and aides about the SLL program implementation even though parents are not as involved in the program activities. Also, there existed significant differences about how the SLL program was implemented at each school level. The elementary school level showed a greater level of satisfaction than the other two school levels, and the middle school level indicated a greater level of satisfaction than the high school level about the ways in which their SLL program was implemented. Overall, the parent involvement component appeared to be the weakest area at the elementary and middle school levels followed by the program goals and objectives component at the elementary school level and the staff development component at the middle school level. At the high school level, the program goals and objectives component appeared as the weakest area followed by the staff development

The effective instructional practices appeared to be the strongest area in the implementation of the SLL program at all school levels.

Educational Importance

The research presented in this paper has implications for the effective implementation of programs for SLLs, specifically in areas where changing demographics are impelling districts toward curricular change. The use of a questionnaire to generate data from the varied groups involved in program implementation allows the researcher to explore the program through multiple lenses as well as to hear and acknowledge the many voices of the educational community that comprises the school sites and levels. Traditionally the school culture is seen as fixed and students are asked to conform to that culture. The notion of examining practice from multiple perspectives serves to enhance the concept of the learning community, one where all participants have voice. The data presented in this paper serve not only as a means of ongoing evaluation for one school district, but they further serve as a model for constructing process evaluations at the district and site levels that will facilitate the development of schools as communities of learning that promote student growth.

References

Baker, K. (1992). Ramirez et al.: Led by bad theory. *Bilingual Research Journal, Vol. 16, Nos. 1 & 2*. pp. 63-90.

Collier, V. P. (1992). A synthesis of studies examining long-term language minority student data on academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal, Vol. 16, Nos. 1 & 2*. pp. 187-212.

Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice*. Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing Company, Inc.

Cummins, J. (1994). Primary language instruction and the education of language minority student. In C. F. Leyba (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: EDAC.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento, CA: CABE.

Cummins, J. (1981). "The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students." In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: EDAC.

Krashen, S. D. (1994). Bilingual education and second language acquisition theory. in California State Department of Education (Ed.). In C. F. Leyba (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: EDAC.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). Bilingual education and second language acquisition theory. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority*

students: A theoretical framework. Los Angeles, CA: EDAC.

Krashen, S. D. and Biber, D. (1988). *On course: Bilingual education's success in California*. Sacramento, CA: CABE.

Lessow-Hurley, J. (1990). *The foundations of dual language instruction*. New York, NY: Longman.

Ramirez, J. D. (1992). Executive summary. *Bilingual Rsearch Journal, Vol. 16, Nos. 1 & 2*. pp. 1-62.

Sleeter, C. and Grant, C. (1988). *Making choices for multicultural education*.

Terrill, T. D. (1981). The natural approach in bilingual education. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: EDAC.

Thonis, E. W. (1994). Reading instruction for language minority students. In C. F. Leyba (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: EDAC.

Thonis, E. W. (1981). Reading instruction for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: EDAC.

Willig, A. C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research, Vol. 55, No. 3*, pp. 269-317.

Appendix: Item-by-Item Analysis

Means and Standard Deviations on Four Components

ITEMS		SLL (N = 281) Mean	Std. dev.
Program Goals and Objectives			
1.	Program goals and objectives are developed through a shared decisionmaking process and consensus among staff - administrators, teachers, and parents.	3.65	1.04
2.	Program goals and objectives are clearly communicated to all staff.	3.58	1.10
3.	The school administration has provided leadership and support for achieving program goals and objectives.	3.84	1.00
4.	The program activities are monitored periodically to ensure that good progress is being made toward achieving the program goals.	3.61	.93
5.	All staff - administrators, teachers, support staff, and parents - share responsibilities in achieving the goals and objectives of the program.	3.48	.99
6.	Meetings are held with various staff to examine program objectives and performance.	3.70	1.04
7.	Testing and other evaluation data are examined in determining the attainment of the targeted goals and objectives pertinent to student achievement.	3.54	.91
8.	Program activities specified in the school plan are carried out toward meeting the goals and objectives of the program.	3.77	.86
9.	Parents are informed of the goals and objectives of the program.	3.68	.88
10.	Major goals and objectives of the program specified in the school plan have been accomplished.	3.54	.93
Instructional Practices, Activities and Materials			
11.	Classroom instruction involves high academic expectations and standards for all students.	3.98	.98
12.	Flexible groupings (e.g., cooperative groups, small groups), questioning techniques, and other means of promoting active learning are a regular part of instruction.	4.06	.90
13.	Both basic and higher-order thinking skills (e.g., problem solving, reasoning, inference, etc.) are taught through meaningful learning tasks.	3.88	.86
14.	Instructional services are coordinated among programs - regular program, LEP services, Title 1, GATE, & special instruction services - to meet the needs of all students.	3.61	.99
15.	Instructional materials, approaches, and pacing are differentiated, as appropriate for students with different needs.	3.82	.90

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

16.	Primary language support or sheltered instruction is provided to ensure all students equal access to the core curriculum.	3.80	1.04
17.	All students are equally involved in active learning activities: no students are excluded because of academic ability or limited proficiency in English.	4.07	.94
18.	Very little time is spent on routines and non-instructional activities so that there is sufficient instruction time for student learning.	3.74	.92
19.	Hands-on materials, calculators, and manipulatives are available and commonly used to support content learning.	3.96	.90
20.	A variety of materials - text books, supplies, support materials - are readily available and incorporated into instruction.	3.88	.97
21.	Instructional materials reflect linguistic and cultural diversity of students.	3.63	.92
22.	Library and supplemental materials are available in languages other than English.	3.83	.90
23.	Students elaborate and expand their responses through teacher and peer supported encouragement.	3.84	.83
24.	Learning environment is managed in such a way that all students have equal opportunity to learn.	4.00	.94
25.	Instructional practices reflect the student's need to accelerate, rather than remediation.	3.67	.93
26.	Instructional technology (e.g., computers) is used to support teaching and learning.	3.78	1.04
27.	Instructional activities emphasize meaning and understanding rather than isolated skill building.	3.83	.88
28.	Instruction is coordinated and aligned with the goals and objectives of the program.	3.85	.86
29.	Different content areas of the curriculum are integrated.	3.80	.98
30.	Instructional programs are articulated within & across grade levels and subject areas.	3.62	.97
31.	Lessons are designed to reinforce previously taught concepts and skills while introducing new concepts in a meaningful context.	3.94	.81
32.	Tutors (peers, older students, parents, other volunteers) are used to support the instructional program.	3.70	1.02
Staff Development			
33.	Staff are given opportunities to participate in the development and planning of the staff development program.	3.77	1.08
34.	Staff development areas are identified through staff input and closely linked to needs assessment.	3.62	1.09

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

35.	The content of staff development training is based on a school's identified program needs.	3.73	.94
36.	Staff development is designed to meet the professional development needs of the staff.	3.64	1.01
37.	Staff development activities are appropriate in meeting the targeted goals and objectives of the program.	3.62	1.00
38.	Participants are informed of the scheduling of staff development activities well in advance.	3.76	1.01
39.	Staff development activities are provided as planned, including the number of days specified in the school plan.	3.94	.88
40.	Staff development activities are strongly supported by the principal and other administrators.	4.11	.93
41.	Staff development activities are supported with time and other necessary resources.	3.70	1.05
42.	Staff development and training is provided to all staff including aides and parent volunteers as appropriate.	3.58	.97
43.	The learning objectives and targeted competencies planned for each staff development activity are clearly identified and communicated to the staff.	3.53	.97
44.	Staff development training focuses on the effective use of instructional strategies in meeting the various needs of the students.	3.70	.90
45.	The content of the staff development activity is theoretically sound, up to date, and challenging.	3.55	1.03
46.	Staff development materials are professional quality and relevant to activity objectives.	3.65	.95
47.	Staff development training emphasizes the areas of problem-solving and higher-order thinking skills.	3.59	.97
48.	Follow-up activities and support are provided for effective application of the skills and knowledge provided during staff development.	3.30	1.04
49.	Staff development activities have helped the staff in achieving the goals and objectives of the program.	3.57	.96
50.	The major goals and objectives of staff development have been accomplished.	3.46	.94
Parent Involvement			
51.	Parents are involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs in support of the education of their children.	3.35	.87
52.	The school has a written policy which details parent involvement and activities.	3.66	.88
53.	Parent involvement procedures are clearly communicated to parents and	3.49	.87

used consistently.

54.	The staff are aware of the goals and objectives of parent involvement.	3.46	.93
55.	Parents are provided with opportunities to serve as classroom volunteers, tutors, or aides in school.	3.81	.96
56.	Teachers are provided staff development on the topic of effective parent involvement strategies.	3.06	.98
57.	Parent meetings, workshops, and agenda topics are based on parent needs and concerns.	3.52	.84
58.	Parents are invited to school to observe lessons and other project activities.	3.82	.97
59.	Various strategies are utilized to recruit new parents and to maintain the participation of veteran parents.	3.37	.88
60.	Student progress reports and newsletters are regularly sent to parents at home.	4.15	.88
61.	Staff members provide parents with techniques and workshops in areas of parenting skills to help their children with home learning activities.	3.28	1.01
62.	Translations of written material and interpreters at meetings are provided as necessary.	3.88	.94
63.	Special activities or strategies are provided to parents whose native language is not English.	3.51	.97
64.	Parent involvement is viewed by the school staff as a valuable component of student achievement.	4.03	.89
65.	The staff frequently communicates with parents about their child's activities in class and how they can support these activities at home.	3.90	.94
66.	Parents are highly involved in student activities, programs, academic progress and achievement.	3.17	1.04
67.	The major goals and objectives pertaining to parent involvement have been accomplished.	3.17	.90